



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.       | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------------|------------------|
| 10/649,354   | 08/26/2003  | Florence Eschbach    | 10559-887001 / Intel P176 | 4180             |
| 20985  | 7590        | 12/20/2005           | EXAMINER                  |                  |
| FISH & RICHARDSON, PC<br>P.O. BOX 1022<br>MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022 |             |                      | CHEN, VIVIAN              |                  |
|  |             |                      | ART UNIT                  | PAPER NUMBER     |
|  |             |                      | 1773                      |                  |

DATE MAILED: 12/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/649,354

Applicant(s)

ESCHBACH ET AL.

Examiner

Vivian Chen

Art Unit

1773

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 October 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 August 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/2005 10-14-2005</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Double Patenting*

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1-17 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-32 of copending Application No. 10/649,355. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the copending application claims a two-component pellicle frame thermally bonded to a reticle via an intervening polymeric layer.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a known thermoplastic polyester adhesive (claim 17) as the bonding layer.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over:

(a) IKEDA ET AL (US 6,300,019); or

(b) EYNON (US 6,524,754); or

(c) SHIRASAKI (US 6,639,650);

in view of KALK ET AL (US 6,841,312).

IKEDA ET AL discloses a pellicle frame comprising a pellicle mechanically secured between an upper frame member and a lower frame member, wherein the lower frame member is bonded to a reticle via a localized adhesive layer. (Figures 9A-9B; line 13-53, col. 8)

EYNON discloses a pellicle frame comprising a pellicle mechanically secured between an upper frame member and a lower frame member, wherein the lower frame member is bonded to a reticle via a localized adhesive layer. (Figure 3; line 30-65, col. 3)

SHIRASAKI discloses a pellicle frame comprising a pellicle secured between an upper frame member and a lower frame member, wherein the lower frame member is bonded to a reticle via a localized adhesive layer. (Figure 3; line 61, col. 1 to line 17, col. 2; line 28-55, col. 6; line 11-20, col. 7)

KALK ET AL discloses that it is well known in the art to attach a pellicle frame to a reticle using an intermediate thermoplastic adhesive layer, wherein the frame is bonded to said reticle using said polymeric adhesive and heat and wherein the heating is typically localized to the contact area of the adhesive and frame portions. (lines 25-27, 35-52, col. 2; line 48-55, col. 4; line 6-55, col. 5; line 17-27, col. 6)

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use thermoplastic adhesive systems known to be suitable for use in semiconductor and circuitry manufacture as the localized adhesive layer to secure the two-component pellicle frames of IKEDA ET AL or EYNON or SHIRASAKI in order to facilitate the production of electronic components. It also would have been obvious to select the melting point of the polymeric adhesive (claim 2-3, 10-11) depending on the bonding and thermal characteristics of the materials used in the other components. One of ordinary skill in the art would have applied light pressure during the bonding process (claim 4, 13) in order to secure the frame in position during the bonding process and/or to aid the flow or spreading of the adhesive. One of ordinary skill in the art would have trimmed the polymeric adhesive bead layer in order to fit the exact dimensions of a given pellicle frame (claim 7).

#### ***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments filed 10/3/2005 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### ***Conclusion***

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO**

Art Unit: 1773

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vivian Chen whose telephone number is (571) 272-1506. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8:30 AM to 6 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carol Chaney, can be reached on (571) 272-1284. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

The General Information telephone number for Technology Center 1700 is (571) 272-1700.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

December 8, 2005

  
Vivian Chen  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1773